A COMPARISON OF SHY AND CONFIDENT UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

by

KENT G. SCRIVENS

B.A., University of Calgary, 1981

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Faculty

of

Education

We accpet this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

[redacted]

Dr. Honoré France

[redacted]

Dr. Vance Peavy

[redacted]

Dr. Ronald Hoppe

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

Supervisor: Dr. Honoré France

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the differences between shy and confident university students. The 140 students who participated in the study were enrolled in five different introductory classes in four different faculties at the University of Victoria. They filled out the Social Reticence Scale, which was used to identify three groups: shy (35 subjects), confident (35 subjects) and 'in-between' (70 subjects). The students also responded to a shyness questionnaire. First of all, shy and confident subjects' responses to questionnaire items on locus of control of reinforcement, causal attribution and expectancy were compared. Based upon subjects' self-reported loci of control only, it was found that both the shy and confident subjects surveyed have internalized loci of control. They also have internalized causal attributions for past social difficulties. However, while less than half of the confident subjects had positive expectancies of future social successes, over 75% of the shy subjects had such expectancies. Secondly, shy and confident subjects' responses to questionnaire items on social reticence were also compared. It was found that shy subjects reported having significantly greater difficulties than confident subjects in the following areas: being unable to think of appropriate ideas or replies to state in groups due to fear

or anxiety; being able to think of appropriate ideas or replies but being unable to state them due to fear or anxiety; censoring things which they might say to others out of concern that these things might not be interesting enough; thinking that they have good conversational skills but feeling too inhibited to use them with certain individuals and in certain social situations; and feeling less skilled than others at initiating topics of conversation in social settings and therefore rarely doing so. Thirdly, shy, confident and in-between groups of subjects were also compared with regard to techniques which subjects have used, and techniques which they think might be useful, to successfully cope with shyness in social situations.

Examiners:

[redacted]

Dr. Honoré France

[redacted]

Dr. Vance Peavy

[redacted]

Dr. Ronald Hoppe

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

I wish to extend special thanks to Dr. Honoré France for his support from start to finish on this project and to Drs. Vance Peavy and Ronald Hoppe for their membership on my committee and for their guidance. In addition, I owe a great deal of thanks to Dr. Walter Muir for his assistance in statistical and research matters and to Mr. Ishu Ishiyama whose work in the area of shyness inspired me to do this project and who provided me with invaluable assistance as well.

Chapter I

Statement of the Problem

Shyness is a term which means different things to different people. Zimbardo (1977), a pioneer in shyness research, refrained from defining the term; instead, he had respondents to his survey adopt their own definitions of shyness and then proceed to describe the kinds of people and situations which made them feel shy, and the thoughts, feelings, actions, and physical symptoms associated with their shyness. His efforts, then, were to describe as completely as possible what shyness is like rather than to define it.

Other researchers have defined shyness on the basis of their own studies in the area, but there is considerable variability in these definitions. For instance, Pilkonis (1977, p. 585) defined shyness as "a tendency to avoid social interaction and to fail to participate appropriately in social situations." Ishiyama (1982, p. 15) defined shyness as "the cognitive, emotional and behavioral self-isolating tendency in response to social stress and anxiety by the person with anxious sensitivity to social attention and potential evaluativeness" when in social situations. And Jones and Russell (1982, p. 2-3) defined shyness as "a constellation of attitudes and feelings which interfere with an individual's ability to relate effectively with others and to function in social situations. Such attitudes and feelings include: reticence and a lack of confidence,

particularly in new or unfamiliar social settings; excessive preoccupation with self in the presence of others; inadequate social skills; and disruptive anxiety and self-derogations in social situations."

While Zimbardo and other researchers have provided considerable information about shyness in recent years, it seems that a comprehensive theory of shyness is far from complete. According to Crozier (1982, p. 47), "the study of shyness has been fragmented, and the literature consists of a number of isolated contributions rather than any thorough or systematic investigation of the topic." And as Jones and Russell (1982) point out, the importance of continuing to research, and to develop a theory of, shyness derives from two considerations: First, shyness appears to be a very prevalent problem. Zimbardo (1977) reported that 42% of Americans from 18 to 21 years of age described themselves as being currently shy and 73% indicated that they had been shy at some time in their lives. Secondly, shyness is associated with, and perhaps implicated in, several personal and social problems. For instance, shyness has been found to be positively related to loneliness, fearfulness, self-consciousness, social anxiety, neuroticism, and authoritarianism, and inversely correlated with self-esteem, extraversion, and sociability.

This study involved surveying university students to obtain more information about shyness. The results of this

survey cannot be presumed to necessarily describe the general population. Also, presumably the shy respondents to this survey were not severely or 'pathologically' shy, for it is unlikely that such individuals could function at a university level.

The objectives of this study were as follows: (a) to review the research literature on shyness, specifically on the origins of shyness and experimental counselling treatments of shyness which have been undertaken; (b) to obtain new information through the self-report of subjects in these areas: locus of control of reinforcement; causal attributions for past social difficulties; expectancies regarding future social successes; social reticence; and techniques which they have found, or might find, useful in dealing with shyness in social situations; (c) to compare responses of shy and confident subjects to discover similarities and differences on all aspects of shyness surveyed; (d) to state implications for counselling shy individuals based upon the information obtained; and (e) to state implications for future research in the area of shyness based upon the information obtained.

Chapter II

Review of Literature

Causes of Shyness

Zimbardo (1977) has described various theoretical positions which explain how shyness is caused. These are summarized as follows: First, certain personality trait researchers such as Cattell (1973) claim that shy individuals are born with more sensitive, easily-aroused nervous systems than non-shy individuals and are therefore highly susceptible to threat which leads to avoidance behaviors. Secondly, behavior theorists claim that shyness is a learned phobic reaction to social events. This may be the product of a prior history of negative experiences with people in certain situations either by direct contact or by seeing other people hurt, and/or it may be due to the individual not learning appropriate and necessary social skills, and/or it may be due to the individual expecting to perform inadequately and consequently becoming constantly anxious about performing socially. Thirdly, sociologists and some child psychologists believe that shyness must be understood in terms of social and cultural programming. Overemphasis on competition, success and individuality in our society leaves people who are average or below average in physical appearance, intelligence, socio-economic status, etc., feeling worthless and incompetent. Lastly, social psychologists suggest that shyness may result from faulty labelling. That

is, an individual labels himself or herself as being shy without concrete evidence to support it, and subsequently lives up to the label as in a self-fulfilling prophecy, and/ or may be consistently treated by others in such a way that he/she has no choice but to label himself/herself as shy.

In a study by Ishiyama (1983), face-to-face interviews were conducted with 88 self-proclaimed shy adolescents and adults who were asked to identify the original experience that significantly contributed to the formation of their shyness. The most frequently-stated origins, in the opinion of these subjects, were: (a) being teased or ridiculed by others (31.8% of respondents); (b) being punished, rejected or criticized by others (26.1% of respondents); and (c) factors relating to birth or family circumstances; for example, being the youngest child of elderly parents (23.9% of respondents). Respondents identified parents and peers as being the most important contributors to the formation of their shyness.

Crozier (1982) has outlined two hypotheses which have been set forth in the research literature on shyness to account for its occurrence in people. These are the low self-esteem hypothesis and the social skills deficits hypothesis.

The first hypothesis states that shy individuals have feelings of inferiority and evaluate their personal qualities as being poor. They suppress utterances in social

encounters out of fear that what they have to say will not be worth listening to, will create situations with which they will be unable to cope, or will cause others to develop a low opinion of them. All of this heightens shy individuals' sensitivity to threats to their self-esteem and causes anxiety, which further disrupts and inhibits their performance. Crozier cautions, however, that this hypothesis has been derived from significant bivariate correlations between shyness and self-esteem scales. Upon close examination of self-esteem scale items which best predicted shyness he found little support for notions that shy subjects were low in global or generalized self-esteem or showed heightened sensitivity to criticism or negative evaluation.

The second hypothesis states that shy individuals' difficulties are the product of inadequate social skills or a lack of social skills which accounts for their reticence and keeping in the background in social settings. Crozier cautions here that there is little direct evidence for this hypothesis since the bulk of research into social skills training has not been in relation to shyness generally, but rather, has focused on specific problems such as in dating, public speaking and assertiveness. Also, if a social skills training program does help shy individuals, this may be because it has increased their confidence in their skills which they heretofore did possess.

Characteristics of Shyness

Private and public shyness.

Pilkonis (1977) identified two distinct typologies of shy individuals: the privately shy and the publicly shy. Privately shy individuals are characterized by internal discomfort in social situations (for example, emotional upset and physiological arousal) and fear of negative evaluation. Publicly shy individuals are characterized by avoiding social situations, failing to respond appropriately in social situations (for example, a reluctance to talk, an avoidance of eye contact), and behaving awkwardly which arises from attempts to respond (for example, an inability to be fluent or articulate, physical clumsiness). Furthermore, Pilkonis found that while the phenomenology of privately shy individuals seems to be more aversive due to greater self-consciousness and negative affect than publicly shy individuals, it is publicly shy individuals whose behavioral deficits lead to greater reported difficulty in coping with social anxiety.

Self-specializing tendency.

Ishiyama (1982) administered a modified version of the Stanford Shyness Survey to 96 grade 10 boys and girls to study differences and similarities in shyness and related experiences between shy and non-shy groups. He discovered a possible cognitive factor contributing to shy individuals' social inhibition and poor self-esteem which he labeled the

self-specializing tendency. This was the tendency of many of his subjects to overlook the possibility that others are equally as shy as they are though they do not show this overtly, and thus come to believe that their problems with shyness are unique; that no one else has the same difficulties as they do with being shy. This might cause them to attribute prematurely the cause of their shyness to their personalities and consequently lower their self-esteem.

Attributions of social successes/failures.

It has been hypothesized that shy individuals attribute social successes to luck or chance while they attribute social failures to their own faults, whereas the opposite occurs in confident individuals.

In a study designed to examine the locus of control and attributions for past heterosexual social experiences in 254 single, shy male undergraduates, Girodo, Dotzenroth and Stein (1981) found that subjects with high social self-esteem made internal attributions in explaining past social successes and external attributions of past social failures with persons of the opposite sex. By contrast, low social self-esteem subjects made internal attributions in explaining past social failures with persons of the opposite sex, and external attributions of past social successes. Furthermore, subjects who made internal attributions of past successes had greater expectancies for future successes in heterosexual relations than subjects who made external attributions of

past successes.

Previously, however, Miller and Arkowitz (1977) completed two experiments designed to test the predictions that high social anxiety as measured by the Social Avoidance and Distress Scale (Watson & Friend, 1969) would be associated with internal attribution of social failure and external attribution of social successes as measured by the Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (Rotter, 1966); and that low social anxiety would be associated with internal attribution of social successes and external attribution of social failures. No support was provided for the hypotheses relating attributional patterns to social anxiety, contrary to the findings of Girodo et al.

Immunity to positive social experiences/hypersensitivity to negative social experiences.

Teglasi and Hoffman (1982) found that shy subjects had less intense positive affect than non-shy subjects in response to imagined favorable outcomes in social situations which involved initiating new relationships or interacting with a group of people. On the other hand, shy subjects had more intense negative affect than non-shy subjects in response to imagined unfavorable outcomes in some of the same social situations.

This, they concluded, is in accord with the shy individuals' self-defeating causal attributions--that is, they perceive themselves as having difficulty in specific

social situations or classes of situations and therefore expect negative consequences; and when undesirable outcomes and behaviors occur they attribute them to stable characteristics of the self, thereby confirming the original self-perceptions.

Smith and Sarason (1975) found related results in a study comparing the effects of the same feedback on high or moderately high and low socially anxious subjects--the high or moderately highly anxious subjects perceived the feedback more negatively than the low anxious subjects and, in addition, had a greater expectancy that others would evaluate them negatively.

Finally, Clark and Arkowitz (1975) discovered that, unlike confident male subjects, shy male subjects underestimated the positive aspects of their social skills in interacting with a female confederate and overestimated the negative aspects (that is, their social anxiety).

Anxious self-preoccupation.

Crozier (1979b) has conceptualized shyness as a proneness to anxious self-preoccupation. This is a sort of cognitive distraction in which individuals fear that they are performing incompetently in social situations and will therefore be evaluated negatively by others. By focusing their attention on such thoughts they may fail to prepare what they could say to people and thus remain reticent. Also, they focus on the discrepancy between how they are

actually performing and how they ought to perform and blame this on their shy disposition. All of this leads to anxiety and lowered self-esteem which increases individuals' anxious self-preoccupation.

Fear of negative evaluation.

Another factor which characterized shy people is their fear of negative evaluation, described by Crozier (1979a) as the fear of feeling disapproved of, being ignored, being rejected, being criticized and looking foolish.

Watson and Friend (1969) have defined people with a fear of negative evaluation as being apprehensive about others' evaluations of them, being distressed over people's negative evaluations of them, as avoiding evaluative situations, as expecting that others will evaluate them negatively, and as fearing the loss of social approval; however, the presence of high fear of negative evaluation does not necessarily imply that individuals evaluate themselves negatively or that they are concerned about revealing their inferiority.

In an experiment designed to study the effects of gaining approval or disapproval by a supervisor for performing a particular task, Watson and Friend found that those subjects highly fearful of negative evaluation not only avoided disapproval but sought approval, while low fear of negative evaluation subjects were not approval seekers, and were motivated to work hard on a dull task only if

disapproval was threatened.

Shyness as a dimension of personality/situation.

Crozier (1979a), who examined a number of major factor analytic studies of personality questionnaires, found clear evidence of a shyness factor. In other words, his evidence suggests that shyness is a personality trait. One study by Eysenck and Eysenck (1969), whose findings have been replicated by others, postulates two entirely separate aspects of social shyness: one aspect is introverted social shyness--this is a preference to be alone but the ability to function effectively in the company of others if necessary, and is characterized by quietness and keeping in the background in social situations; the other aspect is neurotic social shyness--this is defined as being troubled about being self-conscious, experiencing feelings of loneliness, being troubled with feelings of inferiority and self-consciousness with superiors, and worrying over humiliating experiences. The neurotic shy person might wish for the company of others but would fear it.

While shyness as a personality trait is apparent, Crozier points out that there is much variance in shy people's responses to social situations, and this is accounted for by differences in these situations. He refers to Zimbardo's (1977) finding that students who rated themselves as shy and those who rated themselves as not shy both considered that they would be more likely to be shy in situations in which

they were the centre of attention, in which they were meeting new people, in which they were dealing with authority figures, and in large groups, whereas they would be less likely to be shy in small task-oriented group situations, one-to-one same sex interactions, and when dealing with parents and siblings. Crozier adds that two factors are useful in explaining what makes both shy and non-shy individuals fear the former situations mentioned above more than the latter situations--first, larger demands are made on competence (for example, meeting new people), and secondly, there is an increased likelihood of being criticized or disapproved of (for example, being the focus of attention, or dealing with authority figures). It does seem, then, that attempts to make predictions about shyness in terms of disposition must take these differences in situation into account.

Crozier expresses some doubt as to whether shyness is truly a personality trait by proposing a cognitive mediating factor, whereby different individuals who occupy similar positions along a dimension of shyness would perhaps respond differently to identical situations due to their unique self-evaluations of whether they could perform competently in such situations. If they believed that they could not perform competently (even though in actuality they could), they would perceive threat to their self-esteem. In this way, apparently identical situations might provide different

cues for threat to different individuals who nevertheless occupied similar positions along the shyness dimension.

Experimental Counselling Treatments of Shyness

Few experiments have been undertaken to test various counselling treatments on shy subjects. However, one such experiment was conducted by Hoffman and Teglasi (1982) who treated self-referred, shy subjects with one of two attributional approaches--cognitive-behavioral and analytic. As predicted, both causal treatments, despite vastly differing views as to the locus and stability of the source of the client's problem, did not differ significantly in effectiveness, and both were superior to the control treatment. A second experiment in counselling shy subjects was conducted by McGlynn, Dechajian, Gienen and Rose (1981) who treated shy male subjects between two interpersonal performance tests with female confederates using cue-controlled relaxation. However, no improvement occurred on any measures due to the relaxation treatment.

More experiments involving counselling treatments have been undertaken in the area of heterosexual social anxiety which is closely associated with shyness. In each of three fairly recent studies by Caldwell, Calhoun, Humphreys and Cheney (1978), Twentyman and McFall (1975), and Geary and Goldman (1978), social skills training consisting of all or some of the following--instructions, modeling, behavior rehearsal, feedback and coaching--was found to be effective,

and superior to any other treatments including assessment controls, systematic desensitization, and traditional insight training.

Gormally, Varvil-Weld, Raphael and Sipps (1981) conducted an experiment in which college males with heterosexual social anxiety were subjected to one of three treatments: cognitive counselling, skills training, and a treatment that combined these two approaches. Compared with a waiting-list control, the three treatments produced significantly greater improvement on three of five outcome measures; no significant differences between the three treatments were obtained on any of the five general outcome measures. The treatments providing cognitive counselling did produce greater change in subjects' maladaptive cognitions; however, no differences between treatments or between the waiting list control and treatment groups were obtained on measures of conversational skill.

Summary of Literature Review

In summary, various causes of shyness have been hypothesized: personality-trait researchers claim that it is inherited; behaviorists claim that it is learned; sociologists and some child psychologists believe that it is due to social and cultural programming; and social psychologists believe that it is due to faulty labels and attributions. Shy individuals who were asked to identify what factors they thought significantly contributed to their

own shyness ranked the following factors as most highly significant: being teased or ridiculed; being punished, rejected or criticized; birth and family-related factors. They identified parents and peers as being the most important contributors to the formation of their shyness. Crozier (1982) outlines two hypotheses which attempt to account for shyness. The first, the low self-esteem hypothesis, states that shyness is due to an individual's feelings of inferiority and inadequacy which arouses anxiety and causes the individual to inhibit his/her social performance. The social skills deficits hypothesis, on the other hand, states that a shy individual performs poorly in social situations and/or keeps in the background and remains reticent because he/she lacks requisite social skills.

Several of the principal characteristics of shyness which have been hypothesized and investigated have been discussed. They are: that there are two distinct typologies of shyness--private and public; that shy individuals have a self-specializing tendency; that shy individuals have internalized attributions of social failures but externalized attributions of social successes; that shy individuals act 'immune' to positive social experiences but are hypersensitive to negative evaluation; and that shyness has been identified as a personality trait but varies according to types of social situations and is affected by individuals' perceived threat to their self-esteem.

Few experiments have been undertaken to test various counselling approaches on shy subjects, but social skills training has proven effective in several experiments designed to treat heterosexual social anxiety which is closely associated with shyness.

Chapter III

Definitions, Problems, Rationales, Hypotheses

Definitions

1. In this study, a shy individual is operationally defined as someone whose score on the Social Reticence Scale (Jones & Russell, 1982) falls within the fourth quartile of scores of all subjects taking part in this study. The Social Reticence Scale assumes that a shy individual is one who: (a) experiences negative affective states such as depression, isolation and loneliness; (b) has problems in meeting new people, making new friends, or enjoying potentially good experiences; (c) has difficulty in being appropriately assertive or expressing opinions and values; (d) does not allow other people to perceive his/her true assets; (e) projects himself/herself poorly so that others may get the impression that he/she is snobbish, bored, unfriendly or weak; and (f) is self-conscious and is excessively preoccupied with his/her own reactions. These characteristics have been set forth by Zimbardo, Pilkonis and Norwood (1975). In this study a confident individual is operationally defined as someone whose score on the Social Reticence Scale falls within the first quartile of scores of all subjects taking part in this study. A confident individual generally will not display the characteristics stated above. An 'in-between' individual is operationally defined as someone whose score on the Social Reticence Scale falls within the

second and third quartile of scores of all subjects taking part in this study.

2. Internal locus of control of reinforcement--the belief that the rewards and punishments which people receive in their lifetimes depend upon their own actions and that they can more or less shape their own destinies.

3. External locus of control of reinforcement--the belief that the rewards and punishments which people receive in their lifetimes occur independently of their own actions and that the future is mainly determined by chance or luck or by environmental factors.

4. Causal attribution--the explanation one gives for something which has happened.

5. Unsuccessful relationship--a relationship in which a person's expectations of it were not met.

6. Positive stroke--attention, praise or reinforcement.

7. Expectancy--what a person thinks is likely to occur in the future.

8. Preoccupation with external social environment--one's paying much attention to what others around him/her are doing when talking with someone at a social function.

9. Social function--a meeting, class or party.

10. Interaction conscious--one's paying much attention to how he/she is communicating with another person at a social function.

11. Other person conscious--one's paying much attention

to what the person he/she is talking to at a social function is really like.

12. Nonverbal behavior conscious--one's paying much attention to the nonverbal behaviors (for example, smiles, frowns, eye contact) of the person he/she is talking to at a social function.

Problems, Rationales, Hypotheses

For each set of related questions on the survey questionnaire devised for this study, a statement of a problem in the form of a research question, a rationale for posing such a research question, and a null hypothesis based on the research question (wherever possible) will now be stated. Dependent variables were measured by subjects' ratings of the extent to which the variables are true of them on a 5-point likert scale, with #5 signifying very true and #1 signifying not true.

1(a) Problem. Is there a dichotomy between shy and confident subjects with regard to internal-external locus of control of reinforcement, and if so, to what extent and in what direction?

(b) Rationale. The locus of control of reinforcement of shy individuals has never been studied before. Since the consequences of individuals with either an extreme internal or external locus of control of reinforcement is very negative (Rotter, 1966), it would be useful to discover whether shy individuals fall into one of these categories in

contrast to confident individuals; if so, the implications for understanding and counselling them would be clearer. For these reasons, shy and confident subjects were asked to self-report on their loci of control of reinforcement; their self-reported loci of control were compared to find out whether differences between them exist. It is expected that the shy subjects' loci of control will be more extreme than those of confident subjects because of their generally poorer emotional and social adjustment; however, it is difficult to predict whether shy subjects' loci of control will be more internalized or externalized than those of confident subjects. Extrapolating from the findings of Girodo et al. (1981) that shy subjects had internal attributions in explaining past social failures and external attributions for past social successes which was the converse of confident subjects, it is possible that shy individuals have an external locus of control in explaining rewards which they have received in their lifetimes and an internal locus of control in explaining punishments which they have received, contrary to confident individuals (see questionnaire items #8, 9 & 10).

(c) Null Hypotheses.

(i) There is no significant difference in the locus of control of reinforcement of shy and confident subjects.

(ii) There is no significant difference in the

extent to which the locus of control of reincforcement of shy and confident subjects is either internalized or externalized.

2(a) Problem. Is there a significant difference in the extent to which shy and confident subjects make the following causal attributions?

(i) that, for the most part, subjects do not take personal responsibility for having relationships with individuals they were attracted to that did not succeed;

(ii) that, for the most part, on the occasions when subjects did not enjoy themselves at social functions, they do not take personal responsibility for this;

(iii) that, for the most part, on the occasions at social functions when subjects have been unable to demonstrate their true personal assets and qualities, they do not take personal responsibility for this;

(iv) that, for the most part, on the occasions when it was difficult for subjects to establish relationships with individuals in whom they were interested, they do not take personal responsibility for this; and

(v) that, for the most part, on the occasions at social functions when subjects did not receive enough 'positive strokes', they do not take personal responsibility for this.

(b) Rationale. An individual's causal attributions of various events will affect his/her emotional and

behavioral reactions to those events. Self-defeating causal attributions toward social events might be a factor in shyness. It is for this reason that the causal attributions of shy versus confident subjects were examined in this study.

Girodo, Dotzenroth and Stein (1981) found that low self-esteem subjects made internalized causal attributions in explaining past social failures and externalized causal attributions for past social successes, which was the converse of high self-esteem subjects. Though Miller and Arkowitz' (1977) findings do not support this, it is hypothesized that shy subjects will make internalized causal attributions for past relationship failures while confident subjects will make externalized causal attributions for the same.

Shy and confident subjects were also compared with regard to their reported difficulties or lack of success in establishing new relationships, in enjoying social functions, in being able to show their true assets and qualities at social functions, in being able to show their true assets and qualities at social functions, and in receiving sufficient 'positive strokes' at social functions. This was in order to find out whether there is a dichotomous pattern in shy and confident subjects' internalized or externalized causal attributions for these social difficulties, and if so, what the pattern is. It is hypothesized that, as with subjects' causal attributions for past relationship failures,

shy subjects will have internalized causal attributions for these difficulties while confident subjects will have externalized causal attributions for them (see questionnaire items #13-17).

Comparisons were made between responses of shy and confident subjects on the above cluster of items and subjects' self-reported loci of control of reinforcement and subjects expectancies for future social successes.

(c) Null hypothesis. There is no significant difference in the extent to which shy and confident subjects make the following causal attributions:

(i) that, for the most part, subjects do not take personal responsibility for having relationships with individuals they were attracted to that did not succeed;

(ii) that, for the most part, on the occasions when subjects did not enjoy themselves at social functions, they do not take personal responsibility for this;

(iii) that, for the most part, on the occasions at social functions when subjects have been unable to demonstrate their true personal assets and qualities, they do not take personal responsibility for this;

(iv) that, for the most part, on the occasions when it was difficult for subjects to establish relationships with individuals in whom they were interested, they do not take personal responsibility for this; and

(v) that, for the most part, on the occasions at

social functions when subjects did not receive enough 'positive strokes', they do not take personal responsibility for this.

3(a) Problem. Is there a significant difference in the extent to which shy and confident subjects have the following expectancies?

(i) that they will have future successes in most of their relationships with persons to whom they are attracted;

(ii) that they will enjoy themselves at most social functions in the future;

(iii) that they will be able to demonstrate their true personal assets and qualities at most social functions in the future;

(iv) that they will be able to establish relationships with persons in whom they are interested, with few difficulties, in the future; and

(v) that they will receive sufficient 'positive strokes' at social functions in the future.

(b) Rationale. An individual's expectancies regarding the likelihood of an event's occurrence or the likely consequences of a certain action will influence his/her behaviors. Self-defeating expectancies regarding social events might be a factor in shyness. It is for this reason that expectancies of shy versus confident subjects were examined in this study.

Girodo et al. (1981) found that shy individuals have lower expectancies for future successes in their relationships than confident individuals. An attempt was made to replicate this finding using another population of subjects. Subjects' expectancies regarding enjoyment of future social functions, ability to establish relationships with new people in whom they are interested, receiving sufficient positive strokes at future social functions, and ability to demonstrate personal assets at future social functions were also surveyed. These dependent variables parallel the causal attributions of subjects which were surveyed in the preceding item.

Intuitive sense plus the findings of Zimbardo, Pilkonis and Norwood (1975) that shy individuals have difficulty in meeting new people and making new friends, in projecting their real personal assets and in feeling self-conscious in social situations indicate that shy subjects' expectancies on each of the above dependent variables would be less positive than those of confident subjects (see questionnaire items #20-24).

(c) Null hypothesis. There are no significant differences in the extent to which shy and confident subjects have the following expectancies:

(i) that they will have future successes in most of their relationships with individuals to whom they are attracted;

(ii) that they will enjoy themselves at most social functions in the future;

(iii) that they will be able to demonstrate their true personal assets and qualities at most social functions in the future;

(iv) that they will be able to establish future relationships with persons in whom they are interested with few difficulties; and

(v) that they will receive sufficient 'positive strokes' at social functions in the future.

4(a) Problem. Is there a significant difference in the extent to which shy and confident subjects will indicate each of the following dependent variables to be the cause of their reticence in social situations?

(i) inattention to formulating responses due to preoccupation with the external social environment;

(ii) inattention to formulating responses due to interaction consciousness;

(iii) inattention to formulating responses due to other-person consciousness;

(iv) inattention to formulating responses due to nonverbal-behavior consciousness;

(v) inability to formulate responses due to fear or anxiety;

(vi) forgetting formulated responses just as one is about to utter them due to fear or anxiety;

(vii) inability to utter formulated responses due to fear or anxiety;

(viii) censoring formulated responses due to concern that they will not be interesting to others;

(ix) rarely seeking information and life experiences which others commonly converse about socially;

(x) feeling inhibited from using one's conversational skills with certain individuals and in certain social situations; and

(xi) feeling less skilled than others at initiating topics of conversation in social settings and therefore rarely doing so.

(b) Rationale. With regard to items #i-iv above, Goffman (1957) suggested that shy individuals might be very preoccupied with the external social environment, interaction conscious, other-person conscious and nonverbal-behavior conscious in social situations. It is hypothesized that, in fact, these are strong tendencies of shy individuals; if they are, it becomes more apparent why shy individuals would have trouble concentrating on what they might say in social situations (and consequently remain silent), and how social situations might be draining, aversive experiences for them. This would have important implications for counselling shy individuals with difficulties conversing in social situations. One would not expect such tendencies to be as great in confident individuals.

With regard to items #v-vii above, Crozier (1979b) discusses two models to explain social reticence: one model suggests that self-focused attention interferes with attention paid to the preparation of utterances; the other model suggests that utterances are continuously prepared but are suppressed and never used. It is hypothesized that due to fear or anxiety either one of these difficulties could occur in shy subjects to a significantly greater extent than in confident subjects.

With regard to item #viii above, it is hypothesized that, due to a strong desire to please and interest others, shy individuals overly-censor what they might say to the point that they are reluctant to say anything at all. One would not expect this to be as frequent an occurrence with confident individuals.

With regard to item #ix above, it is hypothesized that due to a lack of self-confidence and self-esteem shy individuals refrain from taking part in new activities and experiences, especially where other people are involved. And due to their frequent experiencing of negative emotional states such as depression and anxiety (Zimbardo et al., 1975), they are too preoccupied with themselves to be actively engaged in acquiring knowledge. One would not expect this to be as much the case for confident individuals.

With regard to item #x above, it is hypothesized that shy individuals with normal or above normal intelligence do

possess a full repertoire of appropriate conversational skills since they report having no difficulties in socializing with certain individuals or in certain social situations (Crozier, 1979a; Zimbardo, 1977). However, with certain other individuals and in certain other social situations, fear of negative evaluation and anxious self-preoccupation cause them to become too inhibited to use these skills. One would not expect confident individuals to report as much concern of this nature as shy individuals.

Finally, with regard to item #xi above, it is hypothesized that, due to a long history of low self-confidence and unassertiveness, and of substantial reticence in social situations, shy individuals have infrequently experienced what it is like to direct and structure conversations with others as they wish so that they are able to discuss issues of interest to them and to demonstrate their true personal assets. One would not expect this to be as much the case for confident individuals.

(c) Null hypothesis. There is no significant difference in the extent to which shy and confident subjects will indicate each of the following dependent variables to be the cause of their reticence in social situations:

(i) inattention to formulating responses due to preoccupation with the external social environment (see questionnaire item #3);

(ii) inattention to formulating responses due to

interaction consciousness (see questionnaire item #4);

(iii) inattention to formulating responses due to other-person consciousness (see questionnaire item #5);

(iv) inattention to formulating responses due to nonverbal-behavior consciousness (see questionnaire item #6);

(v) inability to formulate responses due to fear or anxiety (see questionnaire item #2);

(vi) forgetting formulated responses just as one is about to utter them due to fear or anxiety (see questionnaire item #11);

(vii) inability to utter formulated responses due to fear or anxiety (see questionnaire item #19);

(viii) censoring formulated responses due to concern that they will not be interesting to others (see questionnaire item #7);

(ix) rarely seeking information and life experiences which others commonly converse about socially (see questionnaire item #12);

(x) feeling inhibited from using one's conversational skills with certain individuals and in certain social situations (see questionnaire item #1); and

(xi) feeling less skilled than others at initiating topics of conversation in social settings and therefore rarely doing so (see questionnaire item #18).

5(a) Problem. What actions have shy and confident subjects taken in the past which have helped them to overcome

their shyness in social situations?

(b) Rationale. In designing effective counselling strategies to help shy individuals to feel more comfortable in interacting in social situations, it would be useful to know what strategies many shy and confident individuals have used successfully in the past and what strategies they think might be useful to try in the future. This item is exploratory in nature, so no hypothesis is made here (see questionnaire item #25).

Chapter IV

Method

Sample

The sample consisted of 140 subjects of which 25% or 35 subjects constituted the shy group, 25% or 35 subjects constituted the confident group, and 50% or 70 subjects constituted the 'in-between' group as determined by the Social Reticence Scale (Jones and Russell, 1982). It was a cluster sample, consisting of students enrolled in one introductory course in the Faculty of Education (physical education), one introductory course in the Faculty of Fine Arts (music), one introductory science course (chemistry) and one introductory arts course (English) in the Faculty of Arts and Science, and one introductory course in the Faculty of Human and Social Development (child care) at the University of Victoria.

The reason why a cluster sampling method was chosen is that it was felt that attempts to obtain a more randomized sample by advertising for subjects might fail in that only quite shy or only quite confident subjects might have responded to an advertisement to participate in the study, thus skewing the subject population in one direction; and/or that too few students would respond to an advertisement asking them to fill out a shyness scale and questionnaire. The classes which were chosen from each faculty were not

chosen randomly, but rather, on the basis of class size and willingness of instructors to allow classtime for their students to participate in the study. Introductory students were chosen as subjects because it was felt that there might be more shy individuals in the first year of a university program than in later years, by which time the shy students might have withdrawn from university or become more confident due to having been on campus and succeeded academically.

Instrumentation

The Social Reticence Scale (see Appendix A).

This is a 22-item self-report measure of dispositional shyness developed by Jones and Russell (1982). Three items were written to tap each of the following seven categories: (a) problems in meeting people, making friends and enjoying good experiences; (b) negative affective states such as depression and loneliness; (c) lack of assertiveness and difficulty in expressing opinions; (d) confusing others as to one's true assets; (e) poor self-projection resulting in the shy person being stereotyped as snobbish, unfriendly, etc.; (f) difficulties in communicating and thinking in the presence of others; and (g) self-consciousness. In addition, a criterion validity item ("Basically I am a shy person") is included in the scale.

Reliability of the Social Reticence Scale.

Internal consistency was assessed in a sample of 533

college students enrolled in general psychology. Coefficient alpha was .91 and split-half reliability with the Spearman-Brown correction for attenuation was .91. Item-whole correlations were significant ($p < .01$). Test-retest reliability was calculated for two separate samples of subjects. The first group of 74 subjects were tested 12 weeks apart with a correlation of .78 ($p < .01$) being found. The second group of 48 subjects were tested 8 weeks apart with a correlation of .88 ($p < .01$) being found--and these subjects were taking a course designed to improve interpersonal skills. Overall, then, the Social Reticence Scale is a reliable measure of shyness.

Validity of the Social Reticence Scale.

Construct validity of the Social Reticence Scale was established by correlating Social Reticence Scale scores on several conceptually related scales of interpersonal functioning. Social Reticence Scale scores were significantly positively correlated with the following: public (.36, $p < .01$) and private (.30, $p < .05$) self-consciousness and social anxiety (.64, $p < .01$)(The Self-Consciousness Scale--Fenigstein, Scheier & Buss, 1975); loneliness (.59, $p < .01$) (self-report scale--Russell, Peplau & Ferguson, 1978); speech anxiety (.46, $p < .01$)(self-report scale--Endler, Hunt & Resenstein, 1962); neurosis (.37, $p < .01$)(The Eysenck Personality Inventory--Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975); less expressed inclusion (.34, $p < .01$) and affection (.41, $p < .01$)

toward others (FIRO-B--Schultz, 1966); anxiety (.45, $p < .01$), depression (.43, $p < .01$) and hostility (.28, $p < .10$) (Multiple Affect Adjective Check List--Zuckerman & Lubin, 1965); powerlessness (.42, $p < .01$) and social isolation (.45, $p < .01$)(Alienation Inventory--Dean, 1961); and jealousy (.55, $p < .01$)(Self-Report Jealousy Scale--Bringly, Roach, Andler & Evenbeck, 1977). Social Reticence Scale scores were significantly negatively correlated with the following: assertiveness (-.64, $p < .01$)(self-report scale--Rathus, 1973); extraversion (-.54, $p < .01$)(The Eysenck Personality Inventory --Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975); and self-esteem (-.69, $p < .01$) (Self-Esteem Inventory--Coopersmith, 1967). Since the Social Reticence Scale correlated with the above-mentioned tests of constructs which constitute the shyness experience, it can be assumed that the scale has good construct validity.

Survey Questionnaire (see Appendix B).

Based upon the author's readings of the research literature on shyness and personal experience, research questions about shyness and rationales for asking them were established, from which the questionnaire items were created.

The survey questionnaire was pretested before being administered to subjects. A small sample of six undergraduate university students at the University of Victoria were asked to fill out the questionnaire in the presence of the experimenter. Verbal and nonverbal feedback was obtained from these individuals about the clarity of

instructions and questions, the exhaustiveness of alternatives and the readability of the questionnaire, and alterations were made to improve the questionnaire on this basis.

An expert in questionnaire design was consulted for assistance in making the questionnaire best accomplish the study objectives; also, an expert in the area of shyness checked the questionnaire for content validity.

Procedure

Five undergraduate introductory classes in four different faculties at the University of Victoria were approached by the experimenter. The nature and purpose of this study were explained briefly to them. They were told that this is a study to find out more about how different people behave in social situations. Subjects were not told that this is a study of shyness so as not to bias their responses to the questionnaire.

Students were asked to volunteer to respond to both the Social Reticence Scale and the survey questionnaire. They were told that if they did not wish to participate in the study they should not fill out either of the forms, but if they did, this would be taken by the experimenter to indicate that they understood the nature, purpose and procedures involved in the study and agreed to participate in it.

In order to protect the anonymity of, and to ensure the confidentiality of, subjects, they were asked not to identify themselves in any way except to indicate their sex on both

of the forms which they filled out.

Data Analysis

All items in the questionnaire which called for a response to a 5-point likert scale were subjected to a chi-square test of significance, two-sample case, at the .05 significance level. The following 2 X 5 contingency table was used for the chi-square test of independence (df=4) of each item:

	not true of me	marginally true of me	somewhat true of me	very true of me	
shy subjects					
confident subjects					

However, because for almost every item on which chi-square analysis was performed the expected frequency was not great enough to satisfy this condition of chi-square analysis, the five response categories of very true, quite true, somewhat true, marginally true, and not true were collapsed into three response categories--very true, somewhat true, and not true--to satisfy the expected frequency requirement of chi-square analysis. Thus, a 2 X 3 contingency table was used in the end for the chi-square test of independence (df=2) of each item.

Item #25 of the shyness questionnaire differed from the

other items in that chi-square analysis was not performed. Subjects were first asked to indicate which of the listed techniques they had successfully used in the past to cope with their shyness in social situations and then were asked to indicate which of the same techniques they thought might be useful to deal with their shyness in the future. In both cases the number of subjects in each of the three groups (shy, confident and in-between) who checked off a particular technique were tallied and percentages of subjects in each group checking off the technique were calculated. The percentages of respondents in each group were compared to one another, and differences between the percentages were arbitrarily classified as follows: very similar (differences being less than 5%); somewhat similar (differences from 5.1 to 9.9%); somewhat different (differences from 10 to 24.9%); and very different (differences of 15% or more).

Furthermore, the magnitude of the percentage of respondents in each group to each technique were arbitrarily classified as follows: very high--over 75%; quite high--55-74%; moderately high--35-54%; low--15-34%; and very low--below 15%.

Comparison of Present Sample with Sample Used to Test the Social Reticence Scale

Jones and Russell (1982) collected normative data for the Social Reticence Scale from several samples of college students enrolled at three different educational institutions.

The number of both male and female subjects was 1,188; the mean was 53.25; the standard deviation was 15.04; the high score was 106 and the low score was 22; and the range was 84. In the present study, the number of both male and female subjects was 140; the mean was 52.79; the standard deviation was 5.93; the high score was 88 and the low score was 22; and the range was 65. While the means of the present sample and Jones and Russell's sample are quite similar, the spread of scores in Jones and Russell's sample is considerably greater, as indicated by a larger range and standard deviation than those of the present sample. Thus, the present sample did not contain as shy or as confident subjects as that from which the normative data for the Social Reticence Scale was obtained. The implication of this is that differences between shy and confident subjects in the present study which were not significant might have been significant had the sample contained more shy and more confident individuals.

Chapter V

Results

The results section will be divided into five subsections: (a) differences between shy and confident subjects pertaining to locus of control, causal attribution and expectancy; (b) comparisons between locus of control, causal attribution and expectancy items; (c) differences between shy and confident subjects pertaining to social reticence; (d) differences by sex on the above items; and (e) techniques used to cope with shyness by shy, confident and 'in-between' subjects.

Significant Differences Pertaining to Locus of Control, Causal Attribution and Expectancy Questionnaire Items (see Table 1)

First of all, no statistically significant differences, as determined by a 2 X 3 chi-square analysis, occurred between shy and confident subjects on any of the three items on locus of control or on any of the five items on causal attribution.

Secondly, statistically significant differences, as determined by a 2 X 3 chi-square analysis, occurred between shy and confident subjects on the following items pertaining to expectancy:

1. "I fully expect that in the future I will be able to establish relationships with individuals I am interested in with few difficulties", with shy subjects having a higher

Table 1

Levels of Significance on Items Pertaining to Locus of Control, Causal Attribution and Expectancy, Between Shy and Confident Subjects

	Item	X^2	DF	Significance
Locus of Control	I believe that the rewards which I receive in my lifetime occur independently of my own actions.	0.16	2	0.92 NS
	I believe that the punishments which I receive in my lifetime occur independently of my own actions.	0.37	2	0.83 NS
	I believe that the future is determined mainly by chance or luck.	2.71	2	0.26 NS
Causal Attribution	I do not take personal responsibility for having relationships with individuals I was attracted to that did not succeed in that my expectations are not met.	0.09	2	0.96 NS
	I do not take personal responsibility for not having an enjoyable time at social functions.	0.38	2	0.83 NS
	I do not take personal responsibility for not being able to demonstrate my true personal assets and qualities in social situations.	0.39	2	0.82 NS
	I do not take personal responsibility for not being able to establish relationships with individuals I was interested in.	0.46	2	0.79 NS
	I do not take personal responsibility for not receiving enough 'positive strokes' at social functions.	2.46	2	0.29 NS

(table continues)

	Item	X^2	DF	Significance
Expectancy	I fully expect to have successful relationships with individuals I am attracted to in the future.	3.63	2	0.16 NS
	I fully expect to enjoy myself at most social functions in the future.	4.80	2	0.09 NS
	I fully expect to be able to demonstrate my true personal assets and qualities in most social situations in the future.	19.17	2	0.0 **
	I fully expect to be able to establish relationships with individuals I am interested in with few difficulties in the future.	19.18	2	0.0 *
	I fully expect to receive enough 'positive strokes' at social functions in the future.	11.18	2	0.0 *

NS--not significant

* --significant

**--2 of 6 cells with EF<5

N=35 shy
35 confident

expectancy in this regard than confident subjects ($p < .01$).

2. "I fully expect that in the future I will receive enough 'positive strokes' at social functions", with shy subjects having a higher expectancy in this regard than confident subjects ($p < .01$).

3. If there had been a sufficient expected frequency of responses to satisfy this requirement of chi-square analysis, a statistically significant difference probably would have occurred on the expectancy that subjects would be able to demonstrate their true personal assets and qualities in most social situations in the future, with shy subjects having a higher expectancy in this regard than confident subjects ($p < .01$).

Statistically significant differences between the two groups were <u>not</u> found on the following two items: "I fully expect that in the future I will have successful relationships with individuals I am attracted to" and "I fully expect that in the future I will enjoy myself at most social functions."

<u>Comparison of Subject Responses to Locus of Control, Causal Attributions and Expectancy Questionnaire Items</u>

Shy and confident subjects' responses to the above items were compared in such a way that the number of subject responses to the three locus of control of reinforcement items, the five causal attribution items and the five expectancy items were tallied, averaged and put into percentages so that item clusters pertaining to locus of control of reinforcement, causal attribution and expectancy were formed. Comparisons of

differences between shy and confident subjects in response to these item clusters were made according to a single percentage score per item cluster, therefore, rather than by individual items within and between each cluster.

As illustrated in Table 2, there is quite a small difference between the locus of control of reinforcement of shy and confident subjects, which are both quite internalized; there is a very small difference between the causal attributions of shy and confident subjects, which are again quite internalized; but there is a very large difference between the expectancy of shy and confident subjects.

There seems to be quite a significant relationship between the locus of control of reinforcement and causal attributions of shy and confident subjects, which is that both are fairly highly internalized as evidenced by percentages of greater than 60% being obtained for both constructs by both groups of subjects.

However, the relationship between locus of control of reinforcement or causal attribution and expectancy in shy and confident subjects does not seem as clear. There seems to be some relationship in shy subjects between internalized locus of control of reinforcement and internalized causal attribution and positive expectancy for future social satisfaction in that all percentages are over 60%. However, such a relationship does not exist for confident subjects whose loci of control of reinforcement and causal attributions are generally quite

Table 2

Averaged Percentages of Shy and Confident Subjects Responding in the Same Way to Questionnaire Items Pertaining to Locus of Control, Causal Attributions and Expectancy

---

Subjects responding with not true of me to the following item clusters:

A. Locus of control

"I believe that the rewards and punishments which I receive in my lifetime occur independently of my own actions and that the future is determined mainly by chance and luck."

Shy	Confident	
79%	71%	QUITE LOW DIFFERENCE

B. Causal attribution

"For the most part I do not take personal responsibility for:
(a) having relationships with individuals I was attracted to that did not succeed in that my expectations were not met.
(b) not having an enjoyable time at social functions.
(c) not being able to demonstrate my true personal assets and qualities in social situations.
(d) not being able to establish relationships with individuals I was interested in.
(e) not receiving enough 'positive strokes' (that is, attention, praise, reinforcement) at social functions."

Shy	Confident	
62%	61%	VERY LOW DIFFERENCE

Subjects responding with very true of me to the following item cluster:

C. Expectancy

"I fully expect that in the future I will:
(a) have successful relationships with individuals I am attracted to.
(b) enjoy myself at most social functions.

(table continued)

(c) be able to demonstrate my true personal assets and qualities in most social situations.
(d) be able to establish relationships with individuals I am interested in with few difficulties.
(e) receive enough 'positive strokes' at social functions."

Shy	Confident	
77%	43%	VERY HIGH DIFFERENCE

---

* Percentages are rounded off to the nearest whole number

** Differences in percentage of responses between shy and confident groups on each of the three item clusters was classified as follows:

very similar = a difference of less than 5%
somewhat similar = between 5.1 and 9.9 percentage points
somewhat different = between 10 and 14.9 percentage points
very different = 15 percentage points or more

*** N = 35 shy
35 confident

internalized but where the percentage of subjects who expect future social satisfaction is below 50%.

Significant Differences Pertaining to Questionnaire Items on Social Reticence

Statistically significant differences, as determined by a 2 X 3 chi-square analysis, occurred between shy and confident subjects on the following items pertaining to social reticence (see Table 3):

1. "Often when I am in a group I am unable to think of an appropriate idea or reply which I could state due to anxiety or fear", with shy subjects rating this as more true of themselves than confident subjects ($p < .01$);

2. "Often when I am in a group I can think of an appropriate idea or reply that I could state but due to fear or anxiety I am unable to do so", with shy subjects rating this as more true of themselves than confident subjects ($p < .01$);

3. If there had been a sufficient expected frequency of responses to satisfy this requirement of chi-square analysis, a statistically significant difference probably would have occurred on the item, "Often when I am in a group I can think of an appropriate idea or reply that I could state but I forget it due to fear or anxiety", with shy subjects rating this as more true of themselves than confident subjects ($p < .01$);

4. "I often censor things that I might say to others because I am concerned that these things will not be of

Table 3

Levels of Significance on Items Pertaining to Reticence in Social Situations, Between Shy and Confident Subjects

	Item	X^2	DF	Significance
1.	When talking with someone at a social function I pay much attention to what other people around us are doing.	2.15	2	0.34 NS
2.	When talking with someone at a social function I pay much attention to the way the two of us are communicating.	5.02	2	0.08 NS
3.	When talking with someone at a social function I pay much attention to what the person is really like.	1.31	2	0.52 NS
4.	When talking with someone at a social function I pay much attention to the person's nonverbal behaviors.	3.40	2	0.18 NS
5.	Often when I am in a group I am unable to think of an appropriate idea or reply which I could state due to anxiety or fear.	25.66	2	0.01 *
6.	Often when I am in a group I can think of an appropriate idea or reply that I could state but I forget it due to anxiety or fear.	8.89	2	0.01 **
7.	Often when I am in a group I can think of an appropriate idea or reply that I could state but due to anxiety or fear I am unable to do so.	9.80	2	0.01 *
8.	I often censor things that I might say to others because I am concerned that these things will not be of interest to them.	13.36	2	0.01 *
9.	I rarely seek new information and life experiences which others commonly converse about socially so that I can contribute to such conversations.	3.90	2	0.14 NS

(table continued)

	Item	X^2	DF	Significance
10.	Though I think that I have good conversational skills, I often feel inhibited from using them with certain individuals and in certain social situations.	31.14	2	0.01 *
11.	I often feel less skilled than others at initiating topics of conversation in social settings and therefore rarely do so.	28.92	2	0.01 *

NS--not significant

* --signficant

**--2 of 6 cells with EF 5

N=35 shy
35 confident

interest to them", with shy subjects rating this as more true of themselves than confident subjects ($p < .01$);

5. "Though I think that I have good conversational skills, I often feel inhibited from using them with certain individuals and in certain social situations", with shy subjects rating this as more true of themselves than confident subjects ($p < .01$); and

6. "I often feel less skilled than others at initiating topics of conversation in social settings and therefore rarely do so", with shy subjects rating this as more true of themselves than confident subjects ($p < .01$).

Statistically significant differences did not occur between the two groups on the following social reticence questionnaire items:

1. "When talking with someone at a social function I pay much attention to what other people around us are doing."

2. "When talking with someone at a social function I pay much attention to the way the two of us are communicating."

3. "When talking with someone at a social function I pay much attention to what the person is really like."

4. "When talking with someone at a social function I pay much attention to the person's nonverbal behaviors."

5. "I rarely seek new information and life experiences which others commonly converse about socially so that I can contribute to such conversations."

Difference by Sex on Locus of Control, Causal Attribution, Expectancy and Social Reticence Questionnaire Items

A 2 X 3 chi-square analysis was performed for each item above on the survey questionnaire by sex of the respondent. However, on no item was there a significant difference in the responses of the two sexes of respondents.

Techniques Used to Cope with Shyness

The first part of problem #5 in Chapter III is concerned with techniques which subjects have successfully used to cope with their shyness in social situations. The three groups of subjects (shy, confident and in-between) were compared to one another in order to discover degrees of similarity of the percentage of subjects in each group responding to each technique. These results are reported in Table 4. The percentage of respondents in each group to each technique are also classified according to how high or low the percentages are. These results are reported in Table 5.

First of all, the percentages of respondents in each of the three groups who do meditation and deep muscle relaxation are very similar, but the percentages are very low. Likewise, percentages of respondents in each of the three groups who talk over what they might say or do beforehand with someone are very similar and the percentages are low. Thirdly, percentages of respondents in the confident and in-between groups who challenge negative self-statements are very similar and the percentages are

Table 4

Comparisons of Shy, Confident and In-Between Groups on Techniques Used to Combat Shyness in Social Situations

Technique	Percentage of respondents per group using the technique			* Degree of similarity between groups re: the percentage of respondents using the technique		
	Shy	Confident	In-between	Shy-confident	Shy-in-between	Confident-in-between
a. Meditated before the social situation.	6	6	3	very similar	very similar	very similar
b. Did deep muscle relaxation before the social situation.	3	6	3	very similar	very similar	very similar
c. Talked over what I might say or do beforehand with a friend or relative or counsellor.	31	34	33	very similar	very similar	very similar
d. Sought encouragement and support from a friend or relative or counsellor.	57	49	40	somewhat similar	very different	somewhat similar
e. Rehearsed what I might say or do by myself beforehand.	57	37	49	very different	somewhat similar	somewhat different
f. Caught myself making negative self-statements about the social	54	29	29	very different	very different	very similar

(table continues)

Technique	Percentage of respondents per group using the technique			* Degree of similarity between groups re: the percentage of respondents using the technique		
	Shy	Confident	In-between	Shy-confident	Shy-in-between	Confident-in-between
event and challenged these negative statements and/or substituted more positive statements for them.						
g. Thought about successes I've had in the past in order to increase my self-confidence.	51	43	61	somewhat similar	somewhat different	very different
h. Took deep breaths and/or told myself to calm down before or during the social event.	49	40	44	somewhat similar	very similar	very similar
i. Rewarded myself afterwards for involving myself in the social situation even though I was reluctant to do so.	43	26	31	very different	somewhat different	very similar

* very similar = a difference of less than 5%
somewhat similar = a difference of between 5.1 & 9.9 percentage points
somewhat different = a difference of between 10 & 14.9 percentage points
very different = a difference of 15 percentage points or more

N = 35 shy
35 confident
70 in-between

Table 5

Magnitude of Percentages of Respondents in Each Group Who Use the Following Techniques

Technique	Percentage of Responses Per Group and Extent of Highness or Lowness*		
	Shy	Confident	In-between
a. Meditated before the social situation.	6-very low	6-very low	3-very low
b. Did deep muscle relaxation before the social situation.	3-very low	6-very low	3-very low
c. Talked over what I might say or do beforehand with a friend or relative or counsellor.	31-low	34-low	33-low
d. Sought encouragement and support from a friend or relative or counsellor.	57-quite high	49-moderately high	40-moderately high
e. Rehearsed what I might say or do by myself beforehand.	57-quite high	37-moderately high	49-moderately high
f. Caught myself making negative self-statements about the social event and challenged these negative statements and/or substituted more positive statements for them.	54-moderately high	29-low	29-low
g. Thought about successes I've had in social situations in the past in order to increase my self-confidence.	51-moderately high	43-moderately high	61-quite high
h. Took deep breaths and/or told myself to calm down before or during the social event.	49-moderately high	40-moderately high	44-moderately high

(table continues)

Technique	Percentage of Responses Per Group and Extent of Highness or Lowness*		
	Shy	Confident	In-between
i. Rewarded myself afterwards for involving myself in the social situation even though I was reluctant to do so.	43-moderately high	26-low	31-low

*very high percentage - over 75%
quite high percentage - 55 to 74%
moderately high percentage - 35 to 54%
low percentage - 15 to 34%
very low percentage - below 15%

N = 35 shy
35 confident
70 in-between

both low. Fourthly, percentages of respondents in both the shy and in-between and confident and in-between groups who take deep breaths and tell themselves to calm down before or during the social event are both very similar and each of the percentages are moderately high. Finally, the percentages of respondents in the confident and in-between group who reward themselves for taking part in the social function afterwards are very similar and both of the percentages are low.

Somewhat similar percentages occur between the shy and confident groups in seeking out encouragement and support from someone, and the percentages are quite high and moderately high respectively; on the same technique, the confident and in-between groups are also somewhat similar with moderately high percentages respectively. Secondly, somewhat similar percentages occur between the shy and in-between groups on rehearsing what to say or do alone beforehand, and the percentages are quite high and moderately high respectively. Thirdly, somewhat similar percentages occur between the shy and confident groups with regard to thinking back on past social successes in order to bolster self-confidence, and the percentages are both moderately high. Finally, percentages of respondents in the shy and confident groups who take deep breaths and tell themselves to calm down before or during the social event are somewhat similar, and the percentages are moderately high.

Somewhat different percentages occur between the confident and in-between groups on rehearsing what to say or do alone beforehand, and the percentages are moderately high. Secondly, somewhat different percentages occur between the shy and in-between groups on thinking back to past social successes in order to bolster self-confidence, and the percentages are moderately high and quite high respectively. Finally, percentages of respondents in the shy and in-between groups who reward themselves for having taken part in the social function afterwards are somewhat different, and the percentages are moderately high and low respectively.

Very different percentages occur between the shy and in-between groups in seeking out encouragement and support from someone, with the percentages being quite high and moderately high respectively. Secondly, very different percentages occur between the shy and confident groups on rehearsing what to say or do alone beforehand, with the percentages being quite high and moderately high respectively. Thirdly, very different percentages occur between both the shy and confident and shy and in-between groups on challenging negative self-statements, with the percentages each being moderately high and low respectively. Next, very different percentages occur between the confident and in-between groups on thinking about past social successes in order to bolster self-confidence, with the percentages being moderately high and quite high respectively. Finally,

percentages of respondents in the shy and confident groups who reward themselves afterwards for taking part in the social function are very different, and the percentages are moderately high and low respectively.

The second part of problem #5 in Chapter III is concerned with techniques which subjects thought might be helpful in coping with their shyness in social situations. Again, the three groups of subjects were compared to each other in order to discover degree of similarity of the percentage of subjects in each group responding to each technique. These results are reported in Table 6. Also, again the percentage of subjects in each group to each technique are classified according to how high or low the percentages are. These results are reported in Table 7.

First of all, very similar percentages occur between all three groups in thinking that deep muscle relaxation would be helpful, but the percentages are very low. Secondly, very similar percentages occur between the confident and in-between groups on thinking that meditation would be helpful, but both of the percentages are again very low. Thirdly, very similar percentages occur between the shy and in-between groups on thinking that talking over what to say or do beforehand with someone would be helpful, and the percentages are both moderately high. Fourthly, very similar percentages occur between the shy and confident groups on thinking that challenging negative self-statements

Table 6

Comparisons of Shy, Confident and In-between Groups on Techniques Which Might Be Useful in Combatting Shyness in Social Situations

Technique	Percentage of respondents per group thinking the technique would be useful			* Degree of similarity between groups re: percentage of subjects thinking technique would be useful		
	Shy	Confident	In-between	Shy-Confident	Shy-in-between	Confident in-between
a. Meditate before the social situation.	17	9	7	somewhat similar	somewhat different	very similar
b. Do deep muscle relaxation before the social situation.	14	9	14	very similar	very similar	very similar
c. Talk over what I might say or do beforehand with a friend or relative or counsellor.	43	34	46	somewhat similar	very similar	somewhat different
d. Seek encouragement and support from a friend or relative or counsellor.	60	29	47	very different	somewhat different	very different
e. Rehearse what I might say or do by myself beforehand.	31	23	37	somewhat similar	somewhat similar	somewhat different
f. Catch myself making negative self-statements about the social event and challenge these negative statements and/or substitute more positive statements for them.	37	37	27	very similar	somewhat different	somewhat different

(table continues)

Technique	Percentage of respondents per group thinking the technique would be useful			* Degree of similarity betwen groups re: percentage of subjects thinking technique would be useful		
	Shy	Confident	In-between	Shy-Confident	Shy-in-between	Confident-in-between
g. Think about successes I've had in social situations in the past in order to increase my self-confidence.	63	46	44	very different	very different	very similar
h. Take deep breaths and/or tell myself to calm down before or during the social event.	37	20	39	very different	very similar	very different
i. Reward myself afterwards for involving myself in the social situation even though I was reluctant to do so.	34	11	43	very different	somewhat similar	very different

* very similar = a difference of less than 5%
somewhat similar = a difference of between 5.1 & 9.9 percentage points
somewhat different = a difference of between 10 and 14.9 percentage points
very different = a difference of 15 percentage points or more

N = 35 shy
35 confident
70 in-between

Table 7

Magnitude of Percentages of Respondents in Each Group Thinking the Following Techniques Would Be Useful

Technique	Percentage of responses per group and extent of highness or lowness *		
	Shy	Confident	In-between
a. Meditate before the social situation.	17-low	9-very low	7-very low
b. Do deep muscle relaxation before the social situation.	14-very low	9-very low	14-very low
c. Talk over what I might say or do beforehand with a friend or relative or counsellor.	43-moderately high	34-low	46-moderately high
d. Seek encouragement and support from a friend or relative or counsellor.	60-quite high	29-low	47-moderately high
e. Rehearse what I might say or do myself beforehand.	31-low	23-low	37-moderately high
f. Catch myself making negative self-statements about the social event and challenge these negative statements and/or substitute more positive statements for them.	37-moderately high	37-moderately high	27-low
g. Think about successes I've had in social situations in the past in order to increase my self-confidence.	63-quite high	46-moderately high	44-moderately high
h. Take deep breaths and/or tell myself to calm down before or during the social event.	37-moderately high	20-low	39-moderately high

(table continues)

Technique	Percentage of responses per group and extent of highness or lowness *		
	Shy	Confident	In-between
i. Reward myself afterwards for involving myself in the social event even though I was reluctant to do so.	34-low	11-very low	43-moderately high

* very high percentage - over 75%
quite high percentage - 55 to 74%
moderately high percentage - 35 to 54%
low percentage - 15 to 34%
very low percentage - below 15%

N = 35 shy
35 confident
70 in-between

would be helpful, and again both percentages are moderately high. Next, the percentages of respondents in the confident and in-between groups who thought that reflecting back on past social successes in order to bolster self-confidence would be helpful are very similar, and the percentages are both moderately high. Finally, the percentages of respondents in the shy and in-between groups who thought that taking deep breaths and telling themselves to calm down would be helpful are very similar, with both percentages being moderately high.

Somewhat similar percentages occur between the shy and confident groups on thinking that meditation would be helpful, and the percentages are low and very low respectively. Secondly, somewhat similar percentages occur between the shy and confident groups on thinking that talking over what to say or do beforehand with someone would be helpful, and the percentages are moderately high and low respectively. Thirdly, somewhat similar percentages occur between the shy and confident groups on thinking that rehearsing what to say or do alone beforehand would be helpful, and both percentages are low; on the same technique the shy and in-between groups are also somewhat similar, with percentages being low and moderately high respectively. Finally, the percentages of respondents in the shy and in-between groups are somewhat similar on thinking that rewarding oneself afterwards for having taken part in the social situation would be helpful,

and the percentages are low and moderately high respectively.

Somewhat different percentages occur between the shy and in-between groups on thinking that meditation would be helpful, with the percentages being low and very low respectively. Secondly, somewhat different percentages occur between the confident and in-between groups on thinking that talking over what to say or do with someone beforehand would be helpful, and the percentages are low and moderately high respectively. Thirdly, somewhat different percentages occur between the shy and in-between groups on thinking that seeking encouragement and support from someone would be helpful, and the percentages are quite high and moderately high respectively. Next, the percentages of respondents in the confident and in-between groups who think that rehearsing what to say or do alone beforehand would be helpful are somewhat different, and the percentages are low and moderately high respectively. Finally, the percentages of respondents in the shy and in-between groups who thought that challenging negative self-statements would be helpful are somewhat different, with the percentages being moderately high and low respectively; on the same technique, the percentages of the confident and in-between groups are also somewhat different, and are moderately high and low respectively.

Very different percentages occur between the shy and confident groups on thinking that seeking encouragement and

support from someone would be helpful, and the percentages are quite high and low respectively; on the same technique, the percentages of the in-between and confident groups are also very different, and are moderately high and low respectively. Next, very different percentages occur between the shy and confident groups with regard to thinking that reflecting back on past social successes in order to bolster self-confidence would be helpful, and the percentages are quite high and moderately high respectively; on the same technique, the percentages of the shy and in-between groups are also very different and are quite high and moderately high also. Thirdly, very different percentages occur between the shy and confident groups on thinking that taking deep breaths and telling oneself to calm down would be helpful, and the percentages are moderately high and low respectively; on the same technique, the percentages of the confident and in-between groups are also very different, and are low and moderately high respectively. Finally, very different percentages occur between the shy and confident groups on thinking that rewarding oneself afterwards for having taken part would be helpful, and the percentages are low and very low respectively; on the same technique, the percentages of the confident and in-between groups are also very different, and are very low and moderately high respectively.

Spaces were left on the questionnaire for respondents

to add other techniques which they have found helpful in dealing with shyness in social situations, and these are listed by group in Table 8. Although there were no other techniques which very large numbers of subjects indicated using to successfully cope with their shyness in social situations, it might be worth mentioning that 6 of the 21 subjects who listed their own techniques indicated that they use alcohol before or during social functions. It is perhaps also noteworthy that more subjects in the in-between group than in the other two groups reported techniques other than those listed which they have found useful. Perhaps it is because these individuals have found ways to cope with their shy feelings at social functions that they do not consider themselves to be more shy.

Table 8

Other Techniques Reported by Subjects Used to Cope with Shyness in Social Situations by Group

Shy group

1. Make positive statements to boost my self-esteem (1 respondent).
2. Drink alcohol and take narcotics (1 respondent).
3. Talk to people I know at the social function (1 respondent).
4. Pray for guidance and self-assurance (1 respondent).
5. Listen to music (1 respondent).

Confident group

1. Become funny and sarcastic (1 respondent).
2. Drink alcohol (1 respondent).

In-between group

1. Drink alcohol (4 respondents).
2. Pray before the social event (2 respondents).
3. Avoid social situations (1 respondent).
4. Play a grandiose role (1 respondent).
5. Make humorous remarks (1 respondent).
6. Use techniques learned in a drama and verbal communication course (1 respondent).
7. Go to social functions with someone (1 respondent).
8. Do not worry about upcoming social functions (1 respondent).
9. Maintain a good personal appearance in order to bolster self-esteem (1 respondent).
10. Do sports to relax (1 respondent).

Chapter VI

Discussion

The discussion section will be divided into six subsections: (a) a discussion of results relating to locus of control, causal attribution and expectancy; (b) a discussion of the results relating to social reticence; (c) shyness and confidence and sex of subjects; (d) implications for counselling shy clients; (e) implications for future research on shyness; and (f) limitations of the present study.

Locus of Control, Causal Attribution and Expectancy

To begin with locus of control of reinforcement, as mentioned in the rationale section of Chapter III, item #1, this construct has never been studied with regard to shy individuals. In the present study, shy and confident subjects were asked to self-report on their loci of control of reinforcement by indicating how true of each of the three statements listed in Table 1 (p. 42) were, and the self-reports of the two groups were compared to find out whether differences existed. While it was expected that the loci of control of shy subjects would be generally more extreme than those of confident subjects, and perhaps externalized in explaining past rewards received but internalized in explaining past punishments received (which was expected to be the converse of confident subjects), no statistically significant differences were found between the two groups.

According to the self-reports of subjects in the present study, it would appear that both groups have internalized loci of control of reinforcement. However, it may be that most subjects in both groups responded as they did to these questionnaire items because they believed such responses to be socially desirable. It may be that the questionnaire items do not adequately measure locus of control and that a reliable and valid locus of control scale should have been used to adequately measure this construct.

Next, as mentioned in the rationale section of Chapter III, item #2, it was hypothesized that shy subjects would make internalized causal attributions for past social difficulties listed in Table 1 (p. 42), while confident subjects would make externalized causal attributions for the same difficulties. In fact, again there were no statistically significant differences between shy and confident subjects on this construct, and the causal attributions of both groups were generally internalized. This statement may not be altogether justified, however, since subjects were asked to rate to what extent they took personal responsibility for the social difficulties, and this may not be the same as believing that the difficulties occurred directly as a result of their own actions. It is possible that individuals could take responsibility for a problem which they did not cause directly by their own actions.

Thirdly, as mentioned in the rationale section of Chapter III, item #3, it was hypothesized that shy subjects would have less positive expectancies for future social successes in the areas listed in Table 1 (p. 42) than confident subjects. This is because shy individuals have difficulty in meeting new people and making new friends, in projecting their real personal assets and in feeling self-conscious in social situations (Zimbardo et al., 1975). However, contrary to what was expected, shy subjects had a statistically significantly higher expectancy than confident subjects that in the future they will be able to demonstrate their true personal assets and qualities in most social situations, will be able to establish relationships with individuals in whom they are interested with few difficulties, and will receive enough 'positive strokes' at social functions. This trend was not seen with regard to expecting to have an enjoyable time at social functions in the future or with regard to expecting to have successful relationships with individuals to whom they are attracted.

Both the shy and confident subjects surveyed demonstrated having an internalized locus of control of reinforcement and correspondingly internalized causal attributions for past social difficulties based upon the self-report items included in the shyness questionnaire. However, while shy subjects had positive expectancies in regard to future social satisfactions as mentioned above, fewer than half of the

confident subjects had such positive expectancies. This seems surprising in that one would expect confident individuals to have had greater social successes than shy individuals and consequently expect similar social successes in the future. It is possible, however, that the reason why more shy than confident subjects have more positive expectancies of future social satisfactions is that they recognize present difficulties in social relationships and, as a somewhat defensive reaction, have become very certain that things must get better in the future; or, on the other hand, perhaps the shy subjects have been working hard to overcome their social difficulties and expect this hard work to pay off in the future. Nevertheless, this finding contradicts Girodo et al.'s (1981) finding that shy individuals have lower expectancies for future successes in their relationships than confident invididuals.

Social Reticence

First of all, included in the rationale section of Chapter III, item #4, is the hypothesis that shy individuals with normal or above normal intelligence do possess a full repertoire of appropriate conversational skills, since they have no difficulties in socializing with certain individuals and in certain social situations; however, fear of negative evaluation and anxious self-preoccupation cause them to be too inhibited to use these skills with certain other individuals and in certain other social situations. This

hypothesis was confirmed in that shy subjects reported that (to a statistically significantly greater extent than confident subjects) they are unable to use their conversational skills with certain individuals and in certain social situations. This means, however, that the shy students surveyed in the present study do not see themselves as having a deficit of conversational skills, which coincides with Crozier's (1982) finding that there is little direct evidence in the research literature that shy persons lack social skills, and also Pilkonis' assertion that willingness to use social skills on the part of shy subjects might be the issue rather than a complete deficit of such skills. This finding supports Crozier's (1979a) contention that shyness is very much situationally determined. (This item is listed in Table 3, p. 49, and is item #10.)

Secondly, it was hypothesized in the rationale section of Chapter III, item #4, that, due to a strong fear of negative evaluation by others and due to a strong desire to please and interest others, shy individuals overly censor what they might say to the point that they are reluctant to say anything at all; this was not expected to be as frequent an occurrence in confident individuals. This hypothesis, too, was confirmed in that, as expected, the shy students surveyed in the present study censor what they might say to others out of concern that what they might say would not be of interest to others to a statistically significantly

greater extent than confident subjects do. This could be a great problem for the shy individual in that the end result of this censoring is reticence and consequently not being able to show others what they think, how they feel, and, in short, what they are really like. This could lead to their being ignored or even rejected by others in social situations. (This item is listed in Table 3, p. 49, and is item #8.)

Thirdly, it was hypothesized in the rationale section of Chapter III, item #4, that, due to a long history of low self-confidence and unassertiveness, and of substantial reticence in social situations, shy subjects have infrequently experienced what it is like to direct and structure conversations with others as they wish, and consequently feel less skilled at doing so than confident subjects. This hypothesis was confirmed in that shy students indicated that they feel statistically significantly less skilled than the confident students at being able to initiate topics of conversation in social settings and therefore rarely do so. The consequences of not doing so would probably be that these shy individuals end up having to make contributions to conversations, the topics of which others choose, probably because these people have a strong interest in and considerable information about such topics. The chances of shy individuals being able to show as much interest and knowledge about such a topic is not nearly as great as that of the initiator or as if they were to

initiate conversations on topics of interest to themselves about which they were well informed. Therefore, shy individuals may not look as interesting or as informed as individuals who are confident enough to initiate topics of conversation. (This item is listed in Table 3, p. 49, and is item #11.)

Fourthly, it was hypothesized in the rationale section of Chapter III, item #4, that self-focused attention interferes with attention paid by shy subjects to the preparation of utterances. This hypothesis seems supported in that the shy students indicated having statistically significantly greater difficulty than the confident students with being unable to think of appropriate ideas or replies to state in groups and with being able to think of them but not being able to use them due to anxiety or fear; also, shy students approached significantly greater difficulty with being able to think of appropriate ideas or replies but forgetting them due to fear or anxiety. Here again, the consequence of such covert behaviors is reticence and the shy person being unable to appear intelligent or informed or interesting to others even though they may be and are simply stifled by fear or anxiety. (These items are listed in Table 3, p. 49, and are items #5 & 6.)

Next, although it was hypothesized in the rationale section of Chapter III, item #4, that, more than the confident subjects, the shy subjects would be more preoccupied with the external social environment, interaction conscious,

other-person conscious and nonverbal-behavior conscious, none of these hypotheses were confirmed. This suggests that these factors taken individually are not what is responsible for shy individuals' difficulty in concentrating on what to say and do in social situations, or that the questionnaire items were not sensitive enough to discern differences, or that the subjects were not confident and shy enough to show significant differences between them on these variables whereas another sample of more extremely shy and confident subjects would do so. (These items are listed in Table 3, p. 48, and are items #1-4.)

Finally, it was hypothesized in the rationale section of Chapter III, item #4, that, more than the confident subjects, the shy subjects might refrain from taking part in new activities and experiences--especially where other people were involved--due to a lack of self-confidence and esteem, and from acquiring new knowledge due to frequent experiencing of negative emotional states which would preoccupy a great deal of time; consequently, they would have less to offer conversationally than confident subjects. However, this hypothesis was not confirmed. It may be that the subjects surveyed in the present study were not 'pathologically' shy and, in fact, this hypothesis might be true of pathologically shy individuals.

Shyness and Confidence in Relation to Sex of the Individual

There was no significant difference between males and

females in relation to their responses to any of the questionnaire items relating to locus of control of reinforcement, causal attribution, expectancy and social reticence. This seems to indicate that shy males and females versus confident males and females see themselves as relating to these variables in basically the same ways.

Implications for Counselling Shy Clients

Since the population of subjects in the present study was first year students enrolled at the University of Victoria, the following suggestions for counselling shy clients can only be safely assumed to have validity for counselling shy first year students at the University of Victoria.

Implications for counselling shy clients based upon the information obtained from problem #5 of Chapter III and from the literature regarding counselling treatments of socially anxious and shy individuals cited in the literature review are as follows:

First of all, interestingly, very few subjects in any of the three groups (shy, confident, and in-between) reported using meditation or deep muscle relaxation before social functions to deal with feelings associated with shyness, and the number of subjects in each group who think that these techniques might be helpful was not much higher. This may be because few of the subjects surveyed are aware of the positive effects of these techniques (for instance, in controlling anxiety); or else, they may see more direct

ways of dealing with shyness (such as changing their attitudes and behaviors and self-talk in social situations) as being more effective. On the other hand, since this sample of shy and confident subjects does not contain extremely confident and shy subjects, perhaps the shy subjects responding to this survey do not feel as much anxiety as the typical shy individual, and so have not needed to use these techniques.

While a low number of subjects in each of the three groups actually have made a practice of rehearsing beforehand what they might say or do at a social function with a friend, relative or counsellor, moderately high numbers of shy and in-between subjects think that this might be helpful compared to a low number of confident subjects.

Techniques such as behavior rehearsal, therefore, might be usefully employed in counselling shy clients. As mentioned earlier, social skills training, consisting of all or some of the following--instructions, modeling, behavior rehearsal, feedback and coaching--have been found effective in treating heterosexual social anxiety by several researchers. The present finding is one more piece of evidence that social skills training is helpful to shy clients, not necessarily because they have a deficit of social skills but because this makes them more aware that they do have social skills and makes them more confident as a result.

Quite a high percentage of shy subjects as well as slightly fewer subjects in each of the other two groups tend to rehearse what they might say or do at social functions by themselves beforehand, and moderately high numbers of both shy and in-between subjects indicated that this might be helpful to do in the future. This suggests that counsellors could be of assistance to shy clients in teaching them the most effective methods for doing such self-rehearsal; for example, by teaching them to do mental imaging and behavior rehearsal.

A moderately high number of shy subjects reported that they challenge their negative self-statements and/or substitute more positive statements for them regarding their shyness in social situations; and a moderately high number of shy and confident subjects think that this procedure would be useful to do in the future. One might infer from this that it would be useful for counsellors to teach the most thorough, systematic and effective cognitive restructuring techniques to shy clients for this purpose, since a large number of shy subjects surveyed here do this to some degree of effectiveness already and believe that it would be helpful to do in the future.

The importance for counsellors to train shy clients to do ongoing, enhancing self-talk and differential relaxation and deep breathing techniques when in social situations seems to be supported in that a moderately high number of subjects

in each of the three groups indicated that taking deep breaths and telling themselves to calm down before and during social functions has successfully helped them to cope with their shy feelings, and a moderate number of shy and in-between subjects indicated that they think this would be helpful to use in the future. Counsellors could teach shy clients to do these techniques more thoroughly and systematically.

Moderately high numbers of both shy and confident subjects and even a higher number of in-between subjects reported that thinking about past social successes bolsters their confidence in dealing with present social situations. Furthermore, quite a high percentage of shy subjects and moderate numbers of the other two groups think that this would be useful to do in the future. This procedure may help individuals to put their shyness problems into better perspective and perhaps would help them to realize the situational--as opposed to dispositional--nature of their problems with shyness. It may be significant that the in-between group of subjects do more of this than the shy group in that perhaps it is because they are able to do this that they are able to think of themselves as less shy or better able to deal with their shyness than the shy group.

Finally, a moderately high number of shy subjects reported that rewarding themselves for taking part in social functions is useful, while few subjects in the other two

groups reported doing so--presumably because the social events themselves are reinforcing enough for them. It may be helpful for counsellors to put some of their clients on self-modification programs whereby clients reinforce themselves in some way for participating in social functions and gradually fade out these external reinforcers as the social events themselves become more rewarding. Interestingly, a low number of shy subjects indicated that they thought that this technique might be helpful to use in the future while a moderately high number of in-between subjects indicated that they have found this useful in the past.

It is possible to speculate from the present study that shy people in general (who have normal or above normal intelligence) have good conversational skills but are inhibited from using them with certain individuals and in certain social situations. It thus seems incumbent upon the counsellor to somehow desensitize shy clients to certain of these individuals and situations in order that they may put their conversational skills to greater use, get more out of interacting with these individuals and in these situations, and make a better impression upon others in the process. Cognitive restructuring might also be a useful technique to try for this purpose, and this is something which a moderately high number of shy subjects thought would be useful. Also, Gormally et al. (1981) did find that cognitive counselling

produces changes in subjects' maladaptive cognitions and this is likely to be one factor in shy individuals' difficulties in socializing with certain people (for example, they may believe that they have nothing interesting to talk about) and in certain social situations. Quite a large number of shy subjects also indicated that thinking about past social successes might be helpful, and this technique could be applied in this context. Finally, a moderately high number of shy subjects thought that rehearsing what they might say and do in social situations could be helpful; therefore, counsellors might try this technique with shy clients in this context as well.

Counsellors might also try one or a number of the above techniques in helping shy clients to deal with their fear and anxiety, which either prevents them from being able to formulate utterances to be used in social situations or prevents them from being able to use the utterances which they otherwise continually formulate but are unable to use.

It is possible to speculate from the present study that shy people in general frequently over-censor things they might say in social situations out of fear that such things would not be interesting to others, and counsellors could greatly help them by teaching them not to censor as much. Two techniques might be especially useful here: the first is cognitive restructuring and helping the shy client to overcome the irrational belief that what he/she has to say

might be any less interesting than what others have to say; the second is by successive approximations to have the shy client try sharing more ideas with individuals familiar to him/her and then gradually try sharing more and more ideas with less and less familiar individuals.

Finally, it is possible to speculate from the present study that shy people in general are less skilled at being able to initiate topics of conversation in social situations; therefore, counsellors could be very helpful if they could strengthen this skill in shy clients. Behavior rehearsal seems like the most logical choice of useful techniques for this problem.

Implications for Future Research on Shyness

Based upon the findings of the present study, the following are recommendations for future research in the area of shyness:

1. Another group of subjects could be administered the Social Reticence Scale to identify shy and confident subgroups and then the subgroups could be administered a reliable and valid locus of control of reinforcement scale to find out whether the present findings with regard to locus of control are supported.

2. A similar study to the present one could be carried out using non-university student populations in order to determine similarities and differences between the shy and confident student subjects in the present study and other

populations of subjects.

3. Experiments could be carried out in which certain of the techniques which subjects in the present study either use or think would be useful in coping with shyness would be compared to one another or to no treatment control groups in helping shy subjects with identified problems of over-censoring, being unable to initiate topics of conversation, being unable to formulate or use formulated utterances due to fear or anxiety, and being unable to use their conversational skills with certain individuals or in certain social situations.

Limitations of the Present Study

The present study has the following limitations:

1. The three questionnaire items on locus of control were not checked for reliability and validity; therefore, firm conclusions cannot be drawn from the data obtained from these items (see Table 1, p. 42).

2. Firm conclusions from subjects' responses to the five questionnaire items on causal attribution cannot be drawn since "taking personal responsibility" for social difficulties may not be the same as believing that the difficulties occurred directly as a result of one's own actions or of luck and chance (see Table 1, p. 42).

Reference Notes

1. Ishiyama, F. I. (1982). Anxious social sensitivity and cognitive fixation. (To be published in Adolescence).

2. Jones, W. H., & Russell, D. (1982). The Social Reticence Scale: An objective instrument to measure shyness. (Unpublished manuscript--extended report of Jones, W. H., & Russell, D. (1982). The Social Reticence Scale: An objective instrument to measure shyness. Journal of Personality Assessment, 46, 629-631).

3. Ishiyama, F. I. (1983). "Origins" or shyness: Personal accounts on shyness-inducing critical incidents in childhood. (Unpublished manuscript).

References

Caldwell, A. T., Calhoun, K. S., Humphreys, L., & Cheney, T. H. (1978, December). Treatment of socially anxious women by a skills training program. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 9(4), 315-320.

Cattell, R. (1973). Personality and mood by questionnaire. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Clark, J. V., & Arkowitz, H. (1975). Social anxiety and self-evaluation of interpersonal performance. Psychological Reports, 36, 211-221.

Crozier, W. R. (1979a). Shyness as a dimension of personality. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 18, 121-128.

Crozier, W. R. (1979b). Shyness as anxious self-preoccupation. Psychological Reports, 44, 959-962.

Crozier, W. R. (1982, January-April). Explanations of social shyness. Current Psychological Reviews, 2(1), 47-59.

Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1969). Personality structure and measurement. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Geary, J. M., & Goldman, M. S. (1978, November). Behavioral treatment of heterosexual social anxiety: A factorial investigation. Behavior Therapy, 9(5), 971-972.

Girodo, M., Dotzenroth, S., & Stein, S. (1981, December). Causal attribution bias in shy males: Implications for

self-esteem and self-confidence. Cognitive Therapy and Research, 5(4), 325-338.

Goffman, E. (1957). Alienation from interaction. Human Relations, 10, 47-60.

Gormally, J., Varvil-Weld, D., Raphael, R., & Snipps, G. (1981). Treatment of socially anxious college men using cognitive counselling and skills training. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28(2), 147-157.

Hoffman, M., & Teglasi, H. (1982). The role of causal attributions in counseling shy subjects. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 29, 132-139.

McGlyn, F. D., Bechajian, C., Giesen, J. M., & Rose, R. L. (1981, December). Effects of cue-controlled relaxation, a credible placebo treatment and no treatment on shyness among college males. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 12(4), 299-306.

Miller, W., & Arkowitz, H. (1977, December). Anxiety and perceived causation in social stress and failure experiences: Disconfirmation of an attribution hypothesis in two experiments. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 86(6), 665-668.

Pilkonis, P. A. (1977a, December). Shyness, public and private, and its relationship to other measures of social behavior. Journal of Personality, 45(4), 585-595.

Pilkonis, P. A. (1977b, December). The behavioral consequences of shyness. Journal of Personality, 45(4), 596-611.

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal vs. external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80, 609.

Smith, R. E., & Sarason, I. G. (1975). Social anxiety and the evaluation of negative interpersonal feedback. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43(3), 429.

Teglasi, H., & Hoffman, M. (1982). Causal attributions of shy subjects. Journal of Research in Personality, 16, 376-385.

Twentyman, C. T., & McFall, R. M. (1975, June). Behavioral training of social skills in shy males. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43(3), 384-395.

Watson, D., & Friend, R. (1969). Measurement of social-evaluative anxiety. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33(4), 448-457.

Zimbardo, P. G., Pilkonis, P., & Norwood, R. (1975). The social disease called shyness. Psychology Today, 8(12), 69-70.

Zimbardo, P. G. (1977). Shyness: What it is, what to do about it. Don Mills, Ontario: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

APPENDIX A

The Social Reticence Scale

The Social Reticence Scale

Please respond to the following questions by indicating the extent to which they are true or typical of you using the following format:

5 -- Very typical of me
4 -- Somewhat typical of me
3 -- Sometimes true, sometimes not true of me
2 -- Somewhat untypical of me
1 -- Very untypical of me

___ 1. I frequently have difficulties in meeting new people.

___ 2. I frequently feel depressed or sad.

___ 3. I have a hard time expressing my opinions to others.

___ 4. Even my friends don't seem to know me very well.

___ 5. Many people apparently think that I am unfriendly.

___ 6. It is difficult for me to think clearly in the presence of others.

___ 7. I am very self-conscious.

___ 8. It is difficult for me to make new friends.

___ 9. I frequently feel isolated from other people.

___ 10. I have difficulty being assertive, even when it is appropriate, or I need to be.

___ 11. Most people don't know what I'm really like.

___ 12. Many people may think I'm snobbish or bored because I'm not more outgoing.

___ 13. It is difficult for me to know what to say in a group.

___ 14. Frequently I am preoccupied with my own feelings and reactions.

___ 15. I frequently avoid or don't enjoy potentially good experiences.

___ 16. I often feel lonely.

___ 17. I usually keep quiet in groups, even when I have something to say.

___ 18. Even many of my friends don't know any of my true assets.

___ 19. I'm afraid many people think I am weak.

___ 20. I often have difficulty in communicating effectively.

___ 21. I wish that I wasn't so sensitive to my own thoughts and feelings.

___ 22. Basically I am a shy person.

APPENDIX B

Shyness Questionnaire

Sex: Male _____ Female _____

Please respond to all of the following items. Indicate how true of you each statement is by putting a check mark above the appropriate number on the scale where

5 = very true
4 = quite true
3 = somewhat true
2 = marginally true
1 = not true

For example: 'I usually initiate conversations with strangers.' |1|2|3|4|5|

not true — very true

*** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***

1. Though I think I have good conversational skills (for example: the ability to express personal opinions), I often feel inhibited from using them with certain individuals and in certain social situations.

2. Often when I am in a group I am unable to think of an appropriate idea or reply which I could state due to fear or anxiety.

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

When talking with someone at a social function (that is, a meeting, class or party), I pay much attention to:

3. what other people around us are doing.

4. the way the two of us are communicating.

5. what the person is really like.

6. the person's nonverbal behaviors (for example: smiles, frowns, eye contact).

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

7. I often censor things that I might say to others because I am concerned that these things will not be of interest to them.

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

8. I believe that the rewards which I receive in my lifetime occur independently of my own actions.

9. I believe that the punishments which I receive in my lifetime occur independently of my own actions.

10. I believe that the future is determined mainly by chance and luck.

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

11. Often when I'm in a group I can think of an appropriate idea or reply that I could state but I forget it due to fear or anxiety.

12. I rarely seek new information and life experiences which others commonly converse about socially so that I can contribute to such conversations.

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

For the most part, I do not take personal responsibility for the following difficulties which I have had:

13. having relationships with individuals I was attracted to that did not succeed in that my expectations were not met.

14. not having an enjoyable time at social functions.

15. not being able to demonstrate my true personal assets and qualities in social situations.

16. not being able to establish relationships with individuals I was interested in.

17. not receiving enough 'positive strokes' (that is, attention, praise, reinforcement) at social functions.

---

18. I often feel less skilled than others at initiating topics of conversation in social settings and therefore rarely do so.

19. Often when I'm in a group I can think of an appropriate idea or reply that I could state but due to fear or anxiety I am unable to do so.

I fully expect that in the future I will:

20. have successful relationships with individuals I am attracted to.

21. enjoy myself at most social functions.

22. be able to demonstrate my true personal assets and qualities in most social situations.

23. be able to establish relationships with individuals I am interested in with few difficulties.

24. receive enough 'positive strokes' at social functions.

---

25. Which of the following things have you done in the past that successfully helped you to get over your shy feelings (if any) in social situations? (Check off all of the successful actions which you have taken.)

a. ___ meditated before the social situation.

b. ___ did deep muscle relaxation before the social situation.

c. ___ talked over what I might say or do beforehand with a friend or relative or counsellor.

d. ___ sought out encouragement and support from a friend or relative or counsellor.

e. ___ rehearsed what I might say or do by myself beforehand.

f. ___ caught myself making negative self-statements about the social event and challenged these negative statements and/or substituted more positive statements for them.

g. ___ thought about successes I've had in social situations in the past in order to increase my self-confidence.

h. ___ took deep breaths and/or told myself to calm down before or during the social event.

i. ___ rewarded myself afterwards for involving myself in the social situation even though I was reluctant to do so.

Others: _____

_____

_____

*Now please go back over the items in #25 above and circle the letter before each item which you think might be helpful in dealing with your shy feelings (if any) in social situations in the future.

VITA

Surname: SCRIVENS Given Names: KENT GORDON

Place of Birth: ROSETOWN, SASK. Date of Birth: April 30, 1954

Educational Institutions Attended, with Dates of Entering and Leaving:

UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY	1973 to 1974
UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY	1975 to 1977
UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY	1980 to 1981
UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA	1982 to 1984

Degrees, Diplomas, Etc., Awarded, with Dates and Names of Institutions:

B.A.	1981	University of Calgary

Honors and Awards:

Publications:

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant the right to lend my thesis (the title of which is shown below) to users of the University of Victoria Library, and to make single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or similar institution, on its behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or a member of the University designated by me. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis

A COMPARISON OF SHY AND CONFIDENT UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Author [redacted]
(signature)

KENT G. SCRIVENS
(name)

[redacted]
(date)